

**Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board**

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 3, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825

TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2666/ FAX: (916) 263-2668

www.slpab.ca.gov



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY BOARD**

Department of Consumer Affairs
Medical Board of California
1424 Howe Avenue
Greg Gorges Conference Room "F"
Sacramento, CA 95825
(916) 263-2666

**CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 27, 2005**

Committee Members Present

Carol Murphy, M.A., Chairperson
Rebecca Bingea, M.A.
Jennifer Hancock, M.A.

Staff Present

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer
Candace Raney, Staff Analyst
Lori Pinson, Staff Analyst
George Ritter, Legal Counsel

Committee Members Absent

Diana Verdugo M.S.

Board Members Present

Marcia Raggio, Ph.D., Chairperson
Alison Grimes, Au.D.
Lisa O'Connor, M.A.

Guests Present

John DeCure, Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General
Robert Ivory, Audiologist California Academy of Audiology
Robert Powell, California Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Patti Solomon-Rice, Patti Solomon-Rice, M.A. and Associates
Jo Ann Janhunnen, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Ellen C. Fagan, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
Jean Piette, JP Educational Services
Gayle E. Hicks, Neurodynamics, Inc.
Richard Ikeda, Health For All

I. Call to Order

Chairperson Murphy called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

II. Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

III. Continuing Professional Development Course Review Consider Approval for the Continuing Professional Development Provider Application and Program Offering: “Rhythmic Entertainment Intervention (REI) Institute”

Chairperson Murphy directed the Committee to the REI provider application and course materials included in the meeting packets.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that typically the Committee would not be rendering a decision on whether to approve a continuing professional development (CPD) provider application; however, staff was unfamiliar with the subject matter included with the application and needed the assistance of the Committee. She stated that, since the content involved speech-language pathology and audiology, the provider application and supporting documentation were sent to two subject matter experts, a speech-language pathologist and an audiologist, whose recommendations were conflicting. For this reason, the final decision will rest with the CPD Committee.

The Committee discussed the materials at length.

Ms. Bingea and Ms. Murphy commented that the course objectives did not appear to be directly related to treating speech and language disorders.

Ms. Hancock explained that she has had experience with music-based therapy, especially in eliciting responses from autistic children. She further stated that oftentimes the music is used as a reward for children who strive to reach an intervention goal. She stated that music therapy has also been used in hospitals with infant feeding programs to encourage the suck and swallowing reflex of a newborn. Ms. Hancock explained that music is also used with aphasic patients who may not be using both sides of their brain, as the music and singing can encourage activity from the brain's language dominant hemisphere. She stated that, given all of her experience, she believes music therapy has value and can be beneficial.

Ms. Bingea stated that, while many different approaches or tools used to help patients attend to therapy may be helpful and valuable, they are not necessarily practice specific.

Ms. Hancock pointed out that the provider has noted the scientific studies completed on the use of music as a treatment alternative, but also commented that the references to published materials in the provider application were somewhat misleading.

Ms. O'Connor commented that the provider's message stating that music therapy will improve auditory processing is misleading and possibly unfounded.

The Committee determined that the content of the REI operational plan was general and does not reflect therapeutic intervention that has been established and accepted by the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology.

M/S/C: Murphy/Bingea

The Committee voted to deny the provider application and operational plan as submitted by "Rhythmic Entertainment Intervention (REI) Institute."

IV. Review Proposed Continuing Professional Development Emergency Regulations- California Code of Regulation Sections 1399.151.1, 1399.160.3, 1399.160.4 1399.160.6, & 1399.160.7

Ms. Del Mugnaio distributed several documents to those in attendance, including comments prepared by Ms. O'Connor about the regulation proposal, new CPD course tables for approved and denied courses, a memorandum prepared by Ms. Bollenbacher outlining course content areas that have been previously deemed unacceptable for CPD credit but are offered by many CPD providers to speech-language pathologists and audiologists, and documents provided by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) regarding that organization's continuing education program.

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided background regarding the need for the CPD regulation amendments and stated that the Committee and the Board have discussed at a number of prior meetings the need to revisit the CPD regulations and have vetted the pertinent issues at length. She explained that the goal of the Committee is to reexamine the regulations regarding applicable course content and to devise a definition with greater specificity so that licensees and providers will have a better understanding of the types of courses that are acceptable as CPD for speech-language pathologists and audiologists. She also stated that the Committee should decide whether the Board should pursue the authority to review courses.

Ms. Bollenbacher reported that licensees commonly disagree with the Board's decision to deny courses on sensory integration, dementia, behavior modification, and similar related course offerings.

Ms. Ellen Fagan of the Continuing Education (CE) Board of ASHA commented that ASHA reviews the learning outcomes of courses submitted for review and that the learner outcomes must be relevant to speech-language pathology and audiology.

Ms. Grimes commented on previous research conducted by Ms. Del Mugnaio of other allied health boards' continuing education programs and stated that each board had some level of oversight of the acceptable coursework.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that licensees have requested greater flexibility in CPD requirements and, further, would like the Board to adopt the ASHA CE standards. She reported that the Board has an obligation to require that CPD is applicable to the respective practices and is meaningful in terms of the learning experience and benefit to the consumer. It is not appropriate to relinquish this responsibility to a professional organization that has a somewhat different purpose and a different charge in terms of its role in public protection.

Mr. Powell argued that the Board may have gone beyond the intent of the enabling legislation that the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association initially sponsored. He commented that the intent was to allow related courses offered by universities and

medical facilities in order to accommodate the learning needs of practitioners working in various work settings.

Ms. Hicks commented that greater flexibility in CPD requirements should be embraced by the Board as there are a number of areas that overlap with audiology, and that practitioners need such information to perform audiological services effectively.

Ms. Grimes responded and stated that the requirement of 24 hours of directly related course work is minimal and does not preclude or discourage practitioners from participating in other courses that may assist them in doing their job better. She stated that she does not believe the 24 hours in directly related course work is burdensome.

Ms. Del Mugnaio recommended that the Committee form a CPD task force with the charge of developing a regulatory proposal that clarifies acceptable course content areas for direct and indirect client care and that also specifies content areas considered outside the scope of CPD for license renewal. She also stated that the task force should develop a recommendation to the Board as to whether the Board should assume the role of approving individual course offerings.

Ms. O'Connor provided a brief overview of her suggested changes, as distributed at the beginning of the Committee meeting.

Ms. Fagan commented on the substantial time and cost impact for the Board to approve course offerings. She also stated that several ASHA providers may choose not to offer their courses to California licensees because of the added layer of oversight that would limit CPD opportunities for the California licensing population. Ms. Fagan stated that the provider pre-certification process available to exempt providers places a significant liability on the exempt providers to endorse the course offerings of its CE sponsors. She stated that it would be difficult for the exempt provider to confirm that the courses offered by its CE sponsors would be approved by the Board without confirmation of such.

Ms. Del Mugnaio extended her gratitude to Ms. Fagan and Ms. Janhunnen for their written response to the Board's proposed CPD changes and for traveling from Maryland to meet with the Committee. She also thanked Ms. Murphy for her work on preparing useful flowcharts outlining both the Board's existing CPD requirements and those of ASHA.

M/S/C: Murphy/Bingea

The Committee voted to establish a CPD Task Force to develop a final CPD regulation proposal to bring before the Board at the January 26-27, 2006 Board meeting. The CPD task force is composed of Ms. O'Connor, Ms. Grimes, Ms. Murphy, Ms. Solomon-Rice, and Ms. Bollenbacher. The task force will conduct business in an open meeting prior to the January 2006 Board meeting.

V. Consider Development of Continuing Professional Development Subject Matter Expert Training, Guidelines, and Course Evaluation Forms

The Committee reviewed the draft CPD course evaluation form as development by Ms. Bollenbacher and made minor technical changes.

There being no further discussion, Chairperson Murphy adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.